

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 1-28 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 10, and 17 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 4-8, 10, 13-15, 17, 23, 24, and 26 are sought to be amended. New claims 27 and 28 are sought to be added. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner states that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

With respect to claims 1 and 20, the Examiner states that Applicant's newly amended limitation of "the forwarding server to enter, update, and maintain source and destination electronic mail addresses in the database" is not supported by the specification of the instant application. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Figure 1 clearly shows the forwarding server in communication with the database. A database is collection of data that is systematically structured to allow the data to be

easily retrieved and manipulated. The Specification clearly states that the “database 160 is included for entering, updating, and maintaining both source and destination electronic mail addresses for forwarding. The Specification also states that “[u]ser-computers 110 who want their electronic mail forwarded from one account to another account register themselves on the electronic mail forwarding system for disabled accounts 100. That is, the user-computers 110 send a message to the forwarding system’s account 140, e.g. portal@mf.com, where mf.com is the company that provides the forwarding service, over a data communication network 130. … The forwarding system’s account 140 may be located on the server 150 or may be a separate, intermediary computer.” The Specification also states that ‘[a] user-computer 110 wishes to leave her existing Internet Service Provider “expensiveISP.com” to another provider “cheapISP.com.” The user-computer’s 110 old and new electronic mail accounts are user@expensiveISP.com and user@cheapISP.com, respectively. As shown in step 210, before user-computer 110 leaves expensiveISP.com entirely, user-computer 110 registers on the electronic mail forwarding system for disabled accounts 100, e.g., mf.com to have electronic mails forwarded from user@expensiveISP.com to user@cheapISP.com.’ Thus, in order for the registration information for user-computer 110 to be entered into the database 160, it must come from the forwarding system’s account 140 to server 150 to database 160. In an embodiment, the forwarding system’s account 140 may be located on the server 150. Thus, it is the server (or forwarding server) 150 that enables the data to be entered, updated, and maintained in the database 160. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 20.

The Examiner also states that in claims 7, 10, and 17, the limitation of “if the new electronic address is not found” lacks enablement. Applicant has amended claims 7, 10, and 17 to overcome this rejection. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the amended claims and withdraw the rejection of claims 7, 10, and 17.

The Examiner also states that in claims 10 and 17, the limitation of “if the new electronic address is not found, dispatch the electronic [mail] to the user’s old electronic mail address; and send an electronic mail message to the sender indicating that the sender’s electronic mail message to the user is undeliverable” lacks enablement. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Specification, on page 3, line 23 – page 4, line 2, states, “[i]f a new address is not located, then the server 150 simply forwards the electronic mail to the last known electronic mail address.” The Specification, on page 4, lines 14-16, states, “[f]or unresolved electronic mail addresses, the sender-computer 120 will receive the typical messages that describe undeliverable mails, if indeed the electronic mail account is not reachable for some reason.” Also, as previously indicated, Applicant has amended claims 10 and 17 to better define the invention. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 7, 10, and 17.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner, on page 3 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,654,779 to Tsuei in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 to McDowell and U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006 to

Polnerow. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner states that Tsuei substantially teaches Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Tsuei does not teach all of the elements recited in claim 1. For example, Tsuei does not teach or suggest at least the following elements of:

wherein the electronic mail forwarding system is adapted to:

send a confirmation electronic mail with a required password to the user;

receive an electronic mail message from a sender to a recipient that specifies the recipient's old electronic mail address;

forward the electronic mail message to the new electronic mail address, if the new electronic mail address is found.

Unlike the present invention, Tsuei's E-mail Address Management System (EAMS) does not "receive an electronic mail message from a sender to a recipient that specifies the recipient's old electronic mail address." Contrary to the present invention, the EAMS of Tsuei receives a query from the sender's ISP to find out if there is an address change registered with the EAMS for the old system. *Tsuei*, col. 9, lines 53-58; *see also Tsuei*, FIG. 4, item 445. The EAMS will then search the database to see if a new address has been registered. *Id.* at col. 9, lines 59-64; *see also Tsuei*, FIG. 4, item 450. If a new address is found for the old address, the EAMS sends the new address to the sender's ISP. *Id.* at col. 10, lines 24-28; *see also Tsuei*, FIG. 4, item 462. Thus, unlike the present invention's electronic mail forwarding system, the EAMS of Tsuei receives an address query from the sender's ISP to inquire as to whether a forwarding address has been registered with the EAMS.

The sections of Tsuei cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest that the EAMS “forward[s] the electronic mail message to the new electronic mail address.” As indicated above, with Tsuei, if the EAMS finds that a forwarding address has been registered with the system, the EAMS sends the new address (forwarding address) to the sender’s ISP. *Tsuei*, col. 10, lines 24-28; *see also Tsuei*, FIG. 4, item 462. Then, the sender’s ISP forwards the electronic mail message to the intended recipient via the new ISP and notifies the sender of the user’s new address. *Id.* at col. 10 lines 31-36; *see also Tsuei*, FIG. 4, items 465 and 470. Thus, contrary to the present invention, the EAMS sends the new address over the Internet back to the sender ISP and the sender ISP forwards the message to the intended recipient’s new ISP using the new address.

The Examiner also states that Tsuei does not teach Applicant’s elements of: “the forwarding server to enter, update, and maintain the database” and “wherein the electronic mail forwarding system is adapted to: send a confirmation electronic mail with a required password to the user.” Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Tsuei does not teach these elements.

The Examiner then states that McDowell teaches Applicant’s element of “the forwarding server to enter, update, and maintain the database.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. The section of McDowell cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest Applicant’s element of “the forwarding server to enter, update, and maintain the database.” Instead, McDowell teaches an embodiment of the re-route path. *McDowell*, col. 6, lines 45-57; col. 7, lines 11-33.

The Examiner further states that Polnerow teaches registering to use a service, wherein an electronic mail with a required password is sent to the user. Applicant

submits that there is no teaching in either Tsuei or McDowell that would suggest that a password is needed. Also, Polnerow, does not teach or suggest an email forwarding system. Thus, Applicant feels that this rejection is improper.

Thus, neither Tsuei, McDowell, nor Polnerow, separately or in combination, teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited references. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-9).

The Examiner, on page 7 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 3, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,654,779 to Tsuei, U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 to McDowell and U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006 to Polnerow, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,957,248 to Quine *et al.* (hereinafter "Quine"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 3, 6, and 9 depend from independent claim 1 and are patentable over Tsuei, McDowell, and Polnerow for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Quine does not teach or suggest all of the features missing from Tsuei, McDowell, and Polnerow. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 3, 6, and 9.

The Examiner, on page 8 of the Office Action, has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,654,779 to Tsuei, U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 to McDowell and U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006 to Polnerow, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,920,564 to Decuir. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and is patentable over Tsuei, McDowell, and Polnerow for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Decuir does not teach or suggest all of the features missing from Tsuei, McDowell, and Polnerow. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 4.

The Examiner, on page 9 of the Office Action, has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,654,779 to Tsuei, U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 to McDowell, U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006 to Polnerow, and U.S. Patent No. 6,920,564 to Decuir in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138581 to MacIntosh *et al.* (hereinafter “MacIntosh”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1 and is patentable over Tsuei, McDowell, Polnerow, and Decuir for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, MacIntosh does not teach or suggest all of the features missing from Tsuei, McDowell, Polnerow, and Decuir. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 5.

The Examiner, on page 10 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 10-12 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,654,779 to Tsuei, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006 to Polnerow, U.S. Patent No. 6,920,564 to Decuir, and U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 to McDowell. Applicant respectfully traverses

this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to independent claims 10 and 17, Tsuei does not teach or suggest at least the following elements of Applicant's claimed invention:

send a confirmation electronic mail with a required password to the user;
receive an electronic mail message from a sender to a recipient that indicates the recipient's old electronic mail address;
if the recipient's new electronic mail address is found,
forward the electronic mail message to the recipient's new electronic mail address;
if the recipient's new electronic mail address is not found,
dispatch the electronic mail message to the recipient's old electronic mail address.

For the same reasons as indicated above with respect to claim 1, Tsuei's EAMS does not appear to teach Applicant's elements of to "receive an electronic mail message from a sender that indicates the user's old electronic mail address as a recipient" or "forward the electronic mail message to the new electronic mail address." Instead, the sections of Tsuei's EAMS receives an address query from the sender's ISP and sends the new electronic mail address to the sender's ISP to enable the sender's ISP to forward the electronic mail message. *Tsuei*, col. 10, lines 36-46.

Tsuei's EAMS also does not teach or suggest "if the new electronic mail address is not found, dispatch the electronic mail message to the user's old electronic mail address." Instead, Tsuei's EAMS notifies the sender's ISP that the new electronic mail address was not found, and the sender's ISP then notifies the sender via e-mail that the message was undeliverable to the old address and that a forwarding address was not provided. *Tsuei*, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 11.

The Examiner also states, and Applicant respectfully agrees, that Tsuei does not teach Applicant's elements of "send[ing] a confirmation electronic mail with a required password to the user", "providing the electronic mail address of the sender to the recipient", and "if the recipient's new electronic mail address is not found, dispatching the electronic mail message to the recipient's old electronic mail address. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Tsuei does not teach or suggest a required password and Polnerow does not teach or suggest an electronic mail forwarding system. Therefore, Applicant feels that this rejection is improper. The Examiner cites Decuir for Applicant's element of "providing the electronic mail address of the sender to the recipient." The section of Decuir cited by the Examiner instead teaches preventing a user from disseminating the e-mail by disabling the ability to edit the TO, CC, and BCC fields to prevent the user from using the reply button to reply to anyone but the original sender. *Decuir*, col. 8, line 66 – col. 9, line 15. McDowell does not solve the deficiencies of Tsuei, Polnerow, and Decuir.

Thus, neither Tsuei, Polnerow, McDowell, nor Decuir, separately or in combination, teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claims 10 and 17. For at least the reasons stated above, claims 10 and 17, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited references. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 10 and 17, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 11-16 and 18-28, respectively).

The Examiner, on page 14 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 13, 16, 22, 24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,654,779 to Tsuei, U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006 to Polnerow, U.S. Patent No. 6,920,564 to Decuir, and U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 to McDowell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,957,248 to Quine *et al.* (hereinafter “Quine”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 13, 16, 22, 24, and 26 depend from independent claims 10 and 17, respectively, and are patentable over Tsuei, Polnerow, Decuir, and McDowell for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Quine does not teach or suggest all of the features missing from Tsuei, Polnerow, Decuir, and McDowell. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 13, 16, 22, 24, and 26.

The Examiner, on page 15 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 14, 15, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,654,779 to Tsuei, U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006 to Polnerow, U.S. Patent No. 6,920,564 to Decuir, and U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 to McDowell in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138581 to MacIntosh. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 14, 15, and 23 depend from independent claims 10 and 17, respectively, and are patentable over Tsuei, Polnerow, Decuir, and McDowell for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, MacIntosh does not teach or suggest all of the features

missing from Tsuei, Polnerow, Decuir, and McDowell. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 14, 15, and 23.

The Examiner, on page 16 of the Office Action, has rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,654,779 to Tsuei, U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006 to Polnerow, U.S. Patent No. 6,920,564 to Decuir, and U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 to McDowell in view of U.S. Patent 6,163,802 to Lin *et al.* (hereinafter “Lin”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 25 depends from independent claim 17 and is patentable over Tsuei, Polnerow, Decuir, and McDowell for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Lin does not teach or suggest all of the features missing from Tsuei, Polnerow, Decuir, and McDowell. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 25.

New Claims

New claims 27 and 28 depend from independent claim 17, and therefore are patentable over the cited art for the reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 17.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/

Dated: June 19, 2006

Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
(202) 986-3179

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026